

Remarks

Claims 36 and 53 have been amended. Support for the amendment is found on page 14, line 31, through page 15, line 2 in conjunction with page 17, lines 18-23 and page 19 line 23 through page 20, line 2. In addition, claim 64 has been amended to correct a typographical error therein.

Claims 36-68 and 70 were rejected as unpatentable over MARK et al. 2003/0118019 in view of PORTER et al. 2001/0033646. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

The Official Action indicates that the resource managers (NRMs) of the claims correspond to routers in the IP network disclosed in MARK et al. because controlling resources of a network is an inherent function of a router. However, this is not correct. A router routes packets, but does not control resources of a network. A conventional router has no knowledge of the resources available in a network and has no functionality to "control" the resources. Indeed, MARK et al. does not disclose an entity that acts a resource manager to control the resources of the network and does not cover resource based admission at all.

In support, applicant offers RFC 2753 (section 4) that defines Policy Enforcement Point (PEP) and Policy Decision Point (PDP). In this architecture, the router is responsible for

packet forwarding and therefore has the role of PEP, while the policy server typically is a separate device that acts as the PDP. An NRM is a resource aware policy server, i.e., a resource aware PDP, and therefore it is typically separated from the router.

PORTER et al. do not make up for the shortcomings of MARK et al., and thus the combination of MARK et al. and PORTER et al. does not make the invention of the present claims obvious. PORTER et al. discloses one network resource manager, while the invention claimed includes communication between different network resource managers. The inter-network network resource manager communication of the present claims (exchanging resource requests, address mapping) is not disclosed or suggested by PORTER et al. alone or in combination with MARK et al.

Accordingly, the present claims avoid the rejection under §103.

In view of the present amendment and the foregoing remarks, it is believed that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment

Docket No. 1505-1078
Appln. No. 10/535,208

to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/Thomas W. Perkins/

Thomas W. Perkins, Reg. No. 33,027
Customer No. 00466
209 Madison Street, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

TWP/jr